

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF  
THE REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION OF GREENSBORO  
TUESDAY, AUGUST 16, 2005**

**REGULAR MEETING**

The Redevelopment Commission of Greensboro met in regular meeting in the Plaza Level Conference Room, Melvin Municipal Building, on Tuesday, August 16, 2005 at 5:10 p.m. Commissioners present were: Chair Joe Wood, Nettie Coad, Scott Lilly and Jerry Leimenstoll. Dan Curry, Barbara Harris and Dyan Arkin represented the Housing and Community Development Department (HCD). Jim Blackwood, Esq., was present as legal counsel for the Commission.

Chair Wood called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked that anyone wishing to speak come up to the microphone, identify themselves, and give their name and address.

**1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 21, 2005.**

Ms. Coad moved approval of the minutes of June 21, 2005 as written, seconded by Mr. Leimenstoll. The Commission voted 3-0-1 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Coad, Lilly. Nays: None. Abstain: Leimenstoll.)

**2. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM. GORRELL STREET NEIGHBORHOOD. SALE OF PROPERTY KNOWN AS 609 GORRELL STREET TO BENNETT COLLEGE.**

Chair Wood said at its last meeting, the Commission voted to hold a public hearing on the sale of 609 Gorrell to Bennett College, a non-profit organization, at the appraised value of \$32,000, for the purpose of erecting a classroom building in accordance with plans and specifications to be approved by the Commission. He then opened the public hearing.

Andrena Coleman, Vice President for Administrative Services for Bennett College, 900 East Washington Street, said they were still anticipating the purchase of the subject property. She handed out copies of the College's proposal for a one-story building on the subject property.

There was no one else present to speak and the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Coleman said cost of the proposed building is approximately \$1.5 million and includes all of the voice data, video, etc. and this cost would be for a complete job. The only thing the School Board would have to put in would be some of the furniture.

Chair Wood said the motion should be for the approval of sale of the property known as 609 Gorrell Street to Bennett College, a non-profit organization, for the appraised value of \$32,000, for the purposes as outlined in the proposal previously submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Curry said this was sort of a two-step process. The Commission could approve the sale in concept but prior to execution of an agreement or transfer of the property to Bennett the Commission or its designee would need to approve final building & site plans and the construction schedule.

There was a discussion regarding when construction would begin. Counsel Blackwood inquired of Ms. Coleman if construction could begin within a year? That would allow the trailer presently located on the

property to be used for this entire school year. The trailer could then be moved during the summer and allow this construction process to go forward.

Chair Wood suggested that they could then agree on two years for the completion of the proposed building.

Ms. Coleman said she felt that would be reasonable for the College.

Mr. Lilly moved that the Redevelopment Commission sell 609 Gorrell Street to Bennett College, a non-profit corporation, for the appraised value of \$32,000, for use in their non-profit partnership with the Guilford County School System, as defined in the proposal; site and building plans shall be approved by the Redevelopment Commission; construction shall start within one year from closing of the sale, with completion to be within two years and a half years from closing of the sale; should the College determine that an extension was need for completion, the College shall return to the Redevelopment Commission for an approval of such extension. Mr. Leimenstoll seconded the motion.

Mr. Leimenstoll said he was concerned with the time line as far as the start of construction was concerned. He said he could see six months in design development before you could even begin to do construction documents. Then you have to get the documents ready, bid it, and then decide which bid fits into the budget. He was afraid that one-year could be very tight.

Ms. Coleman said the other issue that the College was faced with was from the funding agency because this was coming from the Department of Education and they have a grant for one year. So they have to show that they were using that money within that year or be able to encumber at the end of that funding year.

There was a general discussion of how the Commission could assist the College in making sure any grant deadlines were met. Staff was requested to bring this matter back before the Commission in six months for Bennett to provide an update.

Chair Wood called the question. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Coad, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None.)

### **3. OLE ASHEBORO NEIGHBORHOOD. UPDATE FROM STAFF ON 326 AND 328 EAST LEE STREET.**

Included in the Commissioners' packets were the following documents for their review prior to the meeting: June 29, 2005 Offer to Purchase letter to property owner; July 26, 2005 letter from counsel representing property owner; property file memo - chronology of activities; excerpt from January 18, 2005 Redevelopment Commission meeting minutes, referenced in letter from counsel representing property owner.

Ms. Harris said the last direction staff received from the Commission was to make offers on the properties to Mr. Defreitas, which staff did. The 30 day period has passed during which he was asked to respond. Staff received a letter from his attorney expressing some concern and staff felt they would give them an opportunity to be heard before taking any further action.

Lisa Johnson-Tonkins, Esq., with the Hunter Higgins Law Firm, 101 West Friendly Avenue, Suite 500, represented Clarence and Arnetta Defreitas. Ms. Johnson-Tonkins stated Mr. Defreitas had done substantial work to the home. One of his problems was that he had had difficulty getting someone to

come to the house and inspect and approve the plumbing. He told her that when he contacted the Inspections Office, he was told there was a pending lawsuit and that they could not inspect it. That was where they were at this point. He had done a substantial amount of work and if he could get the inspections done, he could go ahead and finish the work.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she did not know what pending lawsuit the Inspections Office was referring to.

Clarence Defreitas, 3406 Canterbury, said he requested the inspection on Monday of last week. He contacted Inspector Nall, who referred him to Inspector Lee Davis. Inspector Davis said the house was not on his schedule or in his area. He called Inspector Amos, one of the inspectors who inspected Mr. Defreitas before. Inspector Amos referred him to Inspector Lee Davis because Inspector Amos was no longer on that side of town. Inspector Lee told him he knew nothing about it. At this point, he was waiting for the electrical, plumbing and framing inspections. As soon as those are done, he would put up the drywall and it would be finished.

Ms. Coad asked Mr. Defreitas if he had contacted staff so that staff could come back to the Commission with a status report on the work. She had been by the property on several occasions, but could never find anyone there.

Chair Wood said staff had made numerous efforts to contact Mr. Defreitas within the past 10 months to no avail and he felt this was 10 months of no cooperation with the Commission.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she was contacted by her father in January on behalf of Mr. Defreitas. The last time they were here, she came before the Commission and they did set out some things and they agreed to meet with staff. Her father represented to her that he had gone to see the property and she had not. Her father said he went by there as late as last week and he contacted her and indicated that he assisted Mr. Defreitas in trying to contact the Inspections Office. Yes, it had taken some time ---

Chair Wood said it was just a question of letting staff do a walk-through and they had tried in January, February, March, April, May and June and they still had not been able to do so.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she was here in January and, for the record, according to the minutes, she was listed as counsel. Nobody from staff contacted her until last week after she wrote Ms. Harris. She was not saying that Mr. Defreitas was in the right for that, but, on the same token, when somebody comes here to represent somebody's interest, that is another avenue to have somebody contacted. If they could not reach Mr. Defreitas, they could have reached her.

Counsel Blackwood said it was not just a question of Mr. Defreitas going ahead and doing the work that caused this. The whole process and idea was the Commission's willingness not to consider acquiring the property was contingent and conditioned on seeing site plans, specifications for the proposed building and how it was going to fit into the neighborhood. Those meetings and seeing those plans has never occurred. So in effect any work that was being performed, although commendable, may or may not be for naught. If he was understanding what had expired in the last eight months, instead of going forward with work, the idea was to go forward with meetings to make certain of what was being proposed for the work, if it would be compatible with plans in the neighborhood so that would have all worked. Then none of that had occurred.

Ms. Harris said in early February Mr. Defreitas met with she and Mr. Curry and they sat down and went through what probably appeared to him to be a daunting amount of information regarding what would be required for a rehabilitation plan. At the time, they told him several times that if he needed

assistance they were available to help him put the information together and asked him if he understood. He said that he did. They also told him at that meeting that any construction he did needed to be based on approved rehabilitation plans. They were aware that he had gone forward with work. A lot of activity was going on from what they could see on the outside, but they had not received a rehabilitation plan or any request from Mr. Defreitas to help him put one together.

Mr. Defreitas said some of the topics he did not understand. Since he understood it now, he would like to move forward. All he was asking the Commission for was that staff not give him a short notice. He worked six days a week, eight hours a day, so it was quite possible he was not at his office when anyone tried to contact him.

Chair Wood told Ms. Johnson-Tonkins that as counsel for Mr. Defreitas, he would have thought that she would have been part of these discussions. She needed to explain to her client that if you purchase property and rehabilitate it in a Redevelopment Area, there were certain rules that must be followed before you can even spit on the property. If the Commission continued this case any further, he certainly hoped that in the best interest of her client that she would make it a point that her client and her both participate in any meetings that need to be participated in with members of this staff.

Counsel Blackwood said there were several statements in this chronology about the general contractor not being available. Was there a general contractor and were there any plans and specifications in the contract with him on what was to be built? From what he had heard, he believed that Mr. Defreitas had been trying to do this piece meal. If this property was not to be acquired, then there had to be some kind of overall plan being proposed about what was being renovated and built and have that brought back to staff and staff could help put it together. He believed Ms. Johnson-Tonkins needed to help Mr. Defreitas to understand how to work through that process.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she agreed with Counsel Blackwood. One of the problems that she was seeing for the first time was that Mr. Defreitas' understanding of what had been going on had not been very clear. She talked with Mr. Defreitas quite a bit and the only thing he had indicated was that he did meet with the people from the Commission and that they told him basically in his words that he needed to get busy. Now that she understood that Mr. Defreitas did not understand the process or the information he had gotten, she would certainly help henceforth.

Mr. Leimenstoll said there were two meetings that, to him, were crucial to this discussion. One took place on February 3 and the other took place on March 17. On February 3, staff met with Mr. Defreitas and discussed the specifics of what he needed to do in order to present a plan that could be evaluated for the Commission by the staff. The meeting on March 17 was a walk-through meeting and it was reiterated at that time that certain things needed to be done so that staff could make a proper evaluation for determining whether or not this was within the expectations of the Commission. Now they were faced with work having been done that they have no understanding of whether or not it meets the criteria discussed on those two days. Staff could not go into the building to look for anything because they don't know what they were looking for because staff did not know what Mr. Defreitas' intentions were.

Mr. Defreitas said he had met with staff and with Building Inspector Amos. Inspector Amos told him what to do and said to him to go ahead, you are doing it right.

Mr. Leimenstoll said Inspector Amos was talking about State Building Codes and what this Commission was talking about was something other than that.

Mr. Curry said part of what they did when they did the one walk-through was they were kind of looking

at things that were in various stages of being done and making comments about that work. Staff mentioned at that point that they would be willing to help Mr. Defreitas find an architect or someone to help put this plan together. He said he would like to reiterate that that offer still stood along with the offer to provide assistance in getting the rehab plan done. He didn't want to say that the process of getting the construction work done wasn't important, but the plan and schedule were more important now for the Commission to understand what Mr. Defreitas' intent was for the finished product. That was something that even a contractor might not be the right person - to do that sort of plan, although some contractors understand how to do that. He thought it was really important for this body to understand what the finished product was that Mr. Defreitas had in mind. The misunderstanding was that when Mr. Defreitas was told to get to work, that meant get to work on a set of plans.

Chair Wood asked Mr. Defreitas who was his contractor? He responded, "Do it myself contractor."

Counsel Blackwood said he needed to know if the Commission was willing to allow further attempts by the homeowner to be able to be able to rehabilitate and renovate this property without its being acquired. If that were the case, then the Commission needed to clearly define for his benefit and his counsel what those are. Basically what those are is to forget about the Building Inspector, who has nothing to do with the initial process. Plan approval must come from this Commission. But then you should give Mr. Defreitas a month or whatever if you are not going to go for that. Then it would be appropriate that specific steps be taken. Before the next week they would have met and, if necessary, we certainly can advise and use Ms. Johnson-Tonkins to assist Mr. Defreitas in preparing those things, if that was the will of the Commission. That was what he was trying to clarify. First, are you willing to give him some more time to try to do that? He was very concerned that Mr. Defreitas was going in the wrong direction by doing this on his own, having misunderstood what needed to be done and having spent money that may be lost. That was a critical error on Mr. Defreitas' part and he didn't want any implication that it was caused by the Commission or the City because it was not. The second thing he wanted to be clear was as this moves forward he wanted all of this to hopefully be a win/win situation for both sides, but he was also going to advise the Commission that if things were not resolved quickly, he did need to put Ms. Johnson-Tonkins on notice that she was in conflict. He wanted the Commission to be aware that if they could not resolve it, he was advising the Commission to advise her that she would not be able to continue to represent Mr. Defreitas if it got into an adversarial type of situation.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she could not represent Mr. Defreitas past this point anyway since her mother was on the City Council and that would be a conflict.

Counsel Blackwood said he wanted her to assist Mr. Defreitas and that was what he was hoping would work out.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she would like to make one comment. Mr. Wood had been very clear in his comment about the fact that the ball had been dropped and she agreed that it been dropped and probably in several places. She would say that initially when they started this meeting, the indication was that Mr. Defreitas had not met with staff. Then it was that Mr. Defreitas has met with staff and was given certain things. Then it was, well, in the last meeting in January when we ended, he was supposed to meet with staff within 30 to 60 days, which he did, and a plan was supposed to be presented.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said she was not trying to say that Mr. Defreitas had done everything that he probably should have, but he had done, in a layman's mind, everything that he was supposed to do. Maybe he should have tried to ask more questions, but when you run your own business for 12 years and you think you have done it on your own and you're just a little too ashamed to ask for help when people actually volunteered to give it to you. She said she hoped the Commission would work with him and work with her, but since January up until this week, she had not gotten any notice. She was not

saying that she couldn't have done more, but she thought it was under control.

Mr. Wood said before he made his decision, he wanted to hear from two Commissioners. He wanted to hear from Ms. Coad because she lived in the neighborhood and had a vested interest. Also he wanted to hear from Mr. Leimenstoll because with his being an architect, he was in effect the Commission's expert.

Ms. Coad said that after reading the chronology of this matter and hearing Ms. Johnson-Tonkins allude to the fact that in Mr. Defreitas' mind he was at these meetings. Clearly there was some misunderstanding on the part of Mr. Defreitas somewhere and the fact that he was his own contractor. She thought that that had been very well spelled out that if you cannot design plans, if you cannot successfully present to staff a plan as to what your intentions were, then he would have to have somebody. That was number one. As to her position here, she would like to see him be able to do that. She had a concern and she had a vested interest in the neighborhood and wants to see any property that was in a dilapidated condition restored. So she was with him if he had the means to do that and the plans to show that he was going to do that. She did think at this point that he needed a time factor that he would have to meet. Otherwise, she would be willing to support his efforts.

Mr. Leimenstoll said the issue in his mind was not who the contractor was, it was not what Mr. Defreitas had done to the building at this point. The issue was the Commission did not know what Mr. Defreitas planned to do in any way that they can evaluate whether or not it meets the guidelines under which this Commission operates. As best he could tell, there were three times when you received information about this. One was the meeting we had here in this room on January 18, the second one was on February 3 and the third time was on March 17. The Building Codes have nothing to do with that. The Commission has to make a decision whether or not what Mr. Defreitas was proposing to do met the guidelines under which this Commission operates. Thus far, Mr. Defreitas had given them nothing with which to make a decision. Until the Commission has that, there were only two choices available: they could proceed to a condemnation hearing or as their counsel suggested give Mr. Defreitas more time to develop that, hoping that Mr. Defreitas now had a very clear understanding of what the Commission needs to have. If staff finds his proposal meets the guidelines that we work under, then the Commission could say yes and the Commission could have Mr. Defreitas move ahead in concert with what we are doing. If not, as our counsel pointed out, you may have spent money that is down the tubes. His recommendation would be that the Commission give Mr. Defreitas a month within which to do that because they want to support initiatives such as that of Mr. Defreitas coming from the community. So the last thing the Commission wanted to do was thwart any efforts that he may have to do this on his own. So he would suggest that the Commission consider a month's time within which Mr. Defreitas would work with the Commission's staff to clarify, as they need to have clarified what you propose to do so that the Commission can make a determination.

Mr. Defreitas said he would like to get a month. At the next meeting he would like to be here with a builder, with an architect to meet with the staff.

Ms. Coad said she wanted to be clear that Mr. Defreitas understand that the burden of providing this was not on staff. What the Commission would like for him to do was to meet with staff, have enough time to get what you need in place. She wanted him to understand that within 30 days, or 45 if needed, that contact had been arranged and takes place.

Mr. Curry said he wanted to clarify a little further what the Commission was asking. It was not just to show up here at the next meeting or two meetings from now with a builder and architect here, but to actually have a set of plans prepared for this property.

Mr. Leimenstoll asked what a 60-day delay in this matter would mean?

Counsel Blackwood said he had not seen the property and he had one concern. He did not want Mr. Defreitas to be spending money doing further projects that may or may not just be out of his wallet and he would not get anything back. On the other hand, he was concerned about making certain that there was no deterioration or problems while things were being looked at.

Mr. Curry said this house, based on his walk-through of it, was relatively stable. It was relatively dry and structurally it was stable enough that a matter of a few weeks or a couple of months wasn't going to change the condition of this house.

Chair Wood said he would be willing to table this matter for 60 days, provided that staff, within the next 10 days, could do a walk-through on the property, and that Mr. Defreitas talks with them and it was made very clear to him, whether there was counsel there or not, of what he had to do. That within this 60 days if staff says he must do a, b, c and d, which means if that was hire a contractor, present a plan, show that financing was available - whatever is deemed necessary. However, staff must be inside that property and give at least a cursory evaluation of where things stand and what needs to be done. The staff could contact the Commissioners by e-mail or some other method and say, our recommendations are that we have looked at the property; it looked like what he had done so far had not harmed the property. He has at least moved forward with some of the things that we have in mind and that we are recommending that he a) hire a contractor, b) - whatever staff feels was necessary. But staff should get inside that house in the next seven to 10 days and at least see if we are on the right track. He was willing to give Mr. Defreitas up to 60 days. No more delays, no more "I'm not available to come to the property." If staff says they will be on the property next Tuesday, then everybody would be on the property next Tuesday. Staff through e-mail should get everybody up to speed and say, "Here's where things stand. It looks like it's in the right direction. Here is our recommendations," and make sure that Mr. Defreitas and any representatives - he would not say counsel - but he did not care who the representatives were, but representatives for Mr. Defreitas. Then such representatives will be on the same page with what needed to be done and that Mr. Defreitas understood what needed to be done to salvage this property and get it back on track.

Ms. Johnson-Tonkins said with respect to the e-mails, would they be between staff and the Commission? Also who would she need to speak with about obtaining a copy of the checklist that was provided to him in February so she could make sure that she was clear on what needed to be done.

Ms. Harris said she felt the need to also state plainly and have Mr. Defreitas agree that obtaining evidence of his ability to obtain financing for the project was a requirement.

Counsel Blackwood said Mr. Defreitas just needed the ability to show whether or not he had his own assets or could get a loan to complete the cost of doing the work. Ms. Johnson-Tonkins could probably help him with that aspect. He said Mr. Defreitas needed someone, and it didn't have to be a contractor, but he needed someone to put together his ideas and thoughts about what he wanted this to end up looking like.

Mr. Curry said that staff would talk with Mr. Defreitas in the next couple of days about possible sources of assistance. They will share resources that they know about to see if they couldn't get this done very quickly so that when we have the meeting on site, those resources would be there. For instance, staff has a list of contractors who do work for the City regularly and some of those contractors would be capable of going in and doing an appraisal and a write-up of this kind of a project. He didn't know exactly what Mr. Defreitas had in mind in terms of the end product.

Counsel Blackwood said he would suggest that when they arranged the meeting, but he was concerned that Mr. Defreitas understood what needed to be done. If Ms. Johnson-Tonkins were there, then maybe then she could provide him with the guidance on assimilating those parts together.

Ms. Johnson-Tompkins said she would get with Mr. Defreitas and if they were going to have the meeting within 10 days, she would need to know in advance when that would be. If it were during the day, she could not even tell them that she could be there.

Ms. Harris said from this point forward, staff would schedule all meetings in writing and copy Ms. Johnson-Tonkins.

Counsel Blackwood said he thought a better way to word that time table was to within 10 days arrange a meeting to occur as promptly as possible acceptable to everybody's schedule.

Ms. Coad moved that the Commission table for 60 days the acquisition of the property at 326-328 East Lee Street until such time as meetings and discussions and plans had been carried out by Mr. Defreitas with staff's instructions, as had been discussed. Mr. Leimenstoll seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Coad, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None.)

#### **4. EASTSIDE PARK NEIGHBORHOOD.**

##### **A. AUTHORIZATION TO PROCEED WITH PLAN AMENDMENT FOR LAND USE CHANGE.**

##### **B. PROPOSAL TO SELL 1845, 1847 AND 1851 SPENCER TO HABITAT FOR HUMANITY FOR 22-UNIT TOWNHOMES PROJECT.**

Ms. Arkin, Community Planner for the Eastside Park Neighborhood, said that Items A and B went hand in hand and she was going to talk about both briefly and there might be some crossover here and then she would pull them back apart so that a motion could be made.

Ms. Arkin said she was here today to request a plan amendment to the Eastside Park Redevelopment Plan. The Commissioners' agenda packets included a memo regarding this plan amendment. It gives a little background and talks about the specific plan amendment. There are three pieces of property here that are owned by the Commission, 1845, 1847 and 1851 Spencer and of these three pieces of property in the Redevelopment Plan, 1845 and 1847 were actually shown as single-family use. 1851 was showing as a multifamily use, which was generally considered to be for rental.

Staff has received a proposal from Habitat, which was in the process of purchasing 400 Bingham, and they would also like to also purchase these lots from the Commission and create a 20-unit townhome for-sale, attached, single-family project in this area here. In order to do that, we would need to change these in the current Eastside Park Redevelopment Plan. 1845 and 1847 Spencer would be changed from single-family residential to single-family attached residential; 1851 Spencer would be changed from multifamily residential to single-family attached residential. Habitat has met twice with the neighborhood regarding this proposal and the neighborhood has given their support. Staff will recommend support of the proposal because this use meets the intent of the Redevelopment Plan to provide homeownership opportunities for low and moderate-income families.

Ms. Arkin said both of these items would require a public hearing. At this meeting, staff was requesting that a time for a public hearing be set at the next Redevelopment Commission meeting. At that meeting



Habitat would be present and would do a full presentation regarding their proposal and how they plan to develop these lots. Staff has seen preliminary plans, she had actually brought rendering that they had given staff and staff has seen preliminary budgets and some preliminary development proposal information. In their budget, they had included \$60,000 for acquisition of the three Commission owned lots. The lots at 1845, 1847 and 1851 Spencer were actually appraised when they were acquired for \$47,500 and the negotiated price being offered by Habitat was \$60,000.

Ms. Coad moved that a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to the Eastside Park Revitalization Plan to restate under the Plan the uses for 1845, 1847 and 1851 Spencer be held at the next Redevelopment Commission meeting. Mr. Leimenstoll seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion (Ayes: Wood, Coad, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None.)

Ms. Coad moved that a public hearing be held to consider the proposed sale of the properties at 1845, 1847 and 1851 Spencer Street to Habitat for Humanity, a non-profit organization, for its non-profit uses in development of the properties for single-family attached for the price of \$60,000, which was in excess of the lots' appraised value, and that it would be subject to the satisfactory review of plans for the improvements, said public hearing to be held at the next meeting of the Redevelopment Commission. Mr. Leimenstoll seconded the motion. The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Coad, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None.)

## **5. WILLOW OAKS NEIGHBORHOOD. UPDATE ON CONVEYANCE OF LOTS TO GREENSBORO HOUSING AUTHORITY.**

Ms. Arkin said in the Commissioners' packet was an update on the conveyance of lots to the Greensboro Housing Authority for the use of Crosland Incorporated of Raleigh for a low-income housing tax credit project. In December of 2004, Commission approved an agreement to convey property acquired for the Willow Oaks Redevelopment to the Greensboro Housing Authority for use this proposed tax credit project. The developer had now been awarded the tax credits and they will be moving forward with the conveyance of this property. This was an update to remind the Commission what they could expect to see within the next few weeks. She listed the documents or summaries of documents the Commission could expect to see. At the September Commission meeting, staff will provide more information on the status of compliance with all of those different pieces that were required for final approval of the conveyance and recommend that the Commission approve the conveyance of the land, if it seemed appropriate at that time.

There was a general discussion concerning this project during which Ms. Arkin answered questions asked by the Commissioners and explained other facets of the project. She also answered some general questions concerning the entire Willow Oaks Project.

## **6. ADDITIONAL BUSINESS.**

Chair Wood said Ms. Coad had invited he and Mr. Lilly and anybody else who would like to come along on Tuesday, August 30, at 10:00 o'clock and they will do a little walk-through, drive-through of the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood for the purpose of looking at properties. This will permit them to see what needs to be done in the Ole Asheboro Neighborhood, along with potential blighted properties for future acquisition. We sort of made it a goal of this Commission that in the next budget year that they would like there to be funds made available by Council to kind of complete Ole Asheboro once and for all and give it the final attention it needs. There would be no action taken – just a tour. They will be taking a number of pictures and notes to file things away for future reference.

Ms. Harris said that they did not have a method of maintaining a permanent record of Executive Session minutes. Staff wanted the Commissioners to be aware of that and ask them how they would like to handle that in the future.

Counsel Blackwood said the Executive Sessions do need to be recorded, but you announce the action at that meeting that that was determined. You maintain what was discussed, but it was sealed until such time as it was then no longer needed for confidentiality, in effect.

The court reporter said she had tapes of all Executive Sessions for the last year. Anything older than that, she didn't have.

Counsel Blackwood recommended that the minutes of Executive Sessions be typed and maintained.

Chair Wood moved that the Commission accept its attorney's recommendation, seconded by Mr. Lilly.

The Commission voted 4-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Wood, Coad, Leimenstoll, Lilly. Nays: None.)

\* \* \* \* \*

There being no further business before the Commission, the meeting was adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Curry, Assistant Secretary  
Greensboro Redevelopment Commission

DC/jd.ps